

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 7092  
**APPLICANT NAME:** Santa Clara Valley Water District  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Bay Area Regional Implementation Grant Proposal  
**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$10,721,000  
**COST MATCH:** \$16,722,000  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$27,443,000

**DESCRIPTION:** The goal is to effectively manage demands and improve regional interconnectivity, resulting in improved water supply reliability for all participants. The conservation program is designed to combine public outreach and financial incentives. It incorporates 5 program elements: 1-Regional Outreach Campaign; 2-New Business Development Plan Review for Water Use Efficiency; 3-San Francisco Bay Area Rollout of the California WaterStar Initiative; 4-High Efficiency Toilet Replacement Program; and 5-Cooling Tower Conductivity Controller Rebate Program. One of the interties is a two-way raw water intertie between Contra Costa Water District and East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The second intertie is an emergency intertie between EBMUD and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

The applicant has a schedule to adopt an IRWMP by December 18, 2006. The IRWMP will have four functional areas: 1) Water Supply and Water Quality, 2) Clean Water and Recycled Water, 3) Flood Protection and Stormwater Management, and 4) Watershed Management and Habitat Protection and Restoration. The IRWMP submitted covers only the Water Supply and Water Quality functional area. This application shares the same Attachment 3 as PIN#6770. This application focuses on water conservation and interties. This proposal is also in proximity/overlies to proposals PIN# 5996, 6456, and 6624.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The reason why this region is appropriate for an IRWMP was not fully described in the application. The region is defined as the San Francisco Bay Area watershed, and RWB boundaries. The applicant provided a map of the participating agencies, and a map of the major water infrastructure, but the maps do not appear to cover the same region. The water infrastructure map is difficult to read. The applicant discusses each agency's water supply and demand for 2020 in good detail and did provide an overview of water quality. However, the social and cultural makeup for the region was not discussed very well. More discussion was needed on the infrastructure for water supply, wastewater treatment, recycled water, desalination, etc.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The objectives were developed as part of the CALFED Bay Area Water Quality and Water Supply Reliability Project. 5 objectives are listed in the application, and challenges related to these objectives are discussed. However, the applicant does not demonstrate the process that was used to determine the objectives, and the functional area document submitted represents only a portion of the total IRWMP. Therefore, it is not certain that these are all the objectives of the full IRWMP. The applicant states that these objectives and priorities serve to steer the planning and implementation of water management policies and projects that will benefit Bay Area water agencies and California.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The application included a discussion of the range of water management strategies considered for the IRWMP. The IRWMP included in the application does not contain a discussion of any water management strategies that were considered but determined to not be applicable to the IRWMP. The application does discuss the added benefits of integration. However, while the application discusses the benefits of pursuing multiple water management strategies, it does not discuss how multiple water management strategies work together to achieve stated objectives.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The application includes a presentation of both short- and long-term priorities. However, the long-term priority projects are not specifically identified as all the long-term projects on the list are either planning or program type documents. The application does not adequately address how the IRWMP's decision making process will be responsive to regional change, nor how implementation of projects will be assessed. Project sequencing is not addressed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The application has a table that depicts projects, the status of each project, and its schedule. Also included are the responsible entities. There is no interdependence identified for the projects. The applicant intermittently pointed out if a project is in the planning stage, a feasibility study, etc. They did not specifically address the economic and technical feasibility of the projects and did not present an institutional structure. The institutional structure "will be formalized once the functional area documents are brought together." Linkages or interdependence between projects were not clearly identified in the application.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant provided a table showing their potential project benefits and impacts. The table did have a column for negative impacts, but there are no significant details provided other than "temporary construction." The applicant's discussion on the benefits of a regional plan was not adequately addressed; it was much too general in nature without specifying how the individual projects would benefit the region. The application does present impacts to other resources. Attachment 3 does not contain a discussion of benefits to DACs.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant lists the short-term projects but no data, technical method, or analysis could be found in the application. Metrics for performance tracking, with a short list of things to be tracked, is shown in a table but is without any detail. Exactly how the metric will monitor performance is unclear. The applicant does not discuss any of the data to be collected or how it will be made available. Data gaps are unknown. A means to measure the performance of each project is not addressed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant will collect, compile, and analyze regional water use data and trends. It is unclear who will actually manage and maintain this data. The applicant states that data will be made available to the SWB. Data will be shared through websites and newsletters. Although the applicant states they will be collecting data, specific details on how or who will be collecting and managing the data have yet to be developed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The application identifies the general public, both local and regional, and the environment as beneficiaries of the IRWMP. The IRWMP identifies local agency and State grants and loans as sources of funding for each project listed. As a result, it appears as though the applicant is heavily relying on State and federal funding to construct or implement projects. Projected capital and O&M costs are listed in a table in the application. It is unclear from the information presented which funds would be used to pay for capital costs and which would be used to pay for O&M, especially since the projected O&M costs are mainly listed as to be determined.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant did not discuss how the IRWMP relates to regional and local planning. A discussion of coordination with local land-use planners is not included. The applicant does not discuss how local planning documents relate to the IRWM and the dynamics between the two levels of planning.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards -Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The application includes stakeholder involvement via a Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). TCC meetings are opened to "interested parties." The application does not detail if these meetings are open to the general public or not, nor does the application detail if any members of the TCC are from the general public. It is difficult to determine if there is a process for stakeholders to influence water management decisions. Public outreach efforts consisted of coordinating with other water related agencies involved with this project. Outreach efforts to the general public are not discussed. The application is vague regarding future stakeholder input. Attachment 3 fails to address DACs or environmental justice concerns. Obstacles to IRWMP implementation are not discussed. Coordination with State and federal agencies is not adequately discussed.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

**Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

12

The proposal consists of implementing three regional projects: a water conservation program and two interties. The goal is to effectively manage demands and improve regional interconnectivity, resulting in improved water supply reliability for all participants. The conservation program is designed to combine public outreach and financial incentives. One of the interties is a two-way raw water intertie between Contra Costa Water District and EBMUD. The second intertie is an emergency intertie between EBMUD and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The applicant does show that the projects in the proposal are consistent with the IRWMP short-term list of projects. The applicant does not discuss source water protection.

**Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.**

6

The applicant selected projects from the short-term project list provided in the IRWMP. However, why these projects were selected from the large list of short-term projects listed in the draft IRWMP could not be found. The applicant did prioritize the projects listed in the proposal; however, it is unclear why one of the intertie projects, which appear to be under construction, was listed as a lower priority than the water conservation programs.

**Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.**

4

The budgets depict costs for land, planning and design, construction costs, and the funding match. Budgets are broken down into specific projects and the overall proposal budget. Almost entire cost match is dedicated to the Hayward intertie project. Funding match is adequate. However, the applicant did not discuss why contingency costs were not depicted for the intertie projects. Additionally, while Attachment 13 states that additional CEQA activities related to the emergency intertie from CCWD to the EBMUD system will be required, the budget for this project does not show any environmental compliance costs.

**Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.**

4

The proposal includes schedules that depict the sequencing and timing of implementation of the overall proposal and individual projects contained within the proposal. The schedule includes all phases of projects included in the proposal; however the schedules provided are somewhat sketchy in detail, and could have provided more detail.

**Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.**

6

The application includes a discussion of the current and expected water management needs concerning supply and demand. The application also includes a discussion of how the proposal will decrease demand (via conservation) and increase water supply reliability in times of emergency via the 2 intertie projects. The proposed projects would prevent raising costs to ratepayers. The applicant makes a vague argument that endangered species would benefit from the proposal, however, the direct connection is not apparent. While the proposal includes a short statement regarding potential negative impacts of non-implementation of the proposal, the statement is not sufficiently detailed.

**Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.**

8

The proposal provides a direct benefit to DACs mainly through the intertie projects by assuring water supply reliability in times of drought or emergency. However, the intertie benefit falls only to DACs in Contra Costa, Alameda, and Peninsula counties. The application includes a table showing DAC percentages by county, but does not provide any back-up material to support the percentages. A narration of how water conservation and intertie elements of the proposal will provide a benefit to DACs is provided. The conservation program had the most direct connection in that it "will be dedicated to reaching the Bay Area's non-English speaking and low-income communities."

**Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.**

4

The proposal would assist in meeting regional water supply reliability in emergencies for a majority of the population in the region. The proposal does not adequately demonstrate that it would significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters or sensitive areas. The connection between decreasing effluent discharge into South San Francisco Bay salt marshes by increased water conservation does not appear to be a significant reduction in the waste stream. The proposal would provide potential drinking water for DACs and other customers in times of emergency through the use of the two interties.

**TOTAL SCORE: 78**